

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 10th April, 1985

No. 9/5/84-Lab/2791.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s S. K. Foils, 17, Industrial Area, Sector 21, Bhiwani.

BEFORE SHRI B.P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 275 of 84

between

SHRI KANHAIYA LAL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S S. K. FOILS, 17,
INDUSTRIAL AREA, SECTOR 21, BHIWANI

Shri Man Singh, A.R., for the workman.

None, for the management.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Kanhaiya Lal and the management of M/s S. K. Foils, 17, Industrial Area, Sector 21, Bhiwani, to this Court, for adjudication,—*vide* Labour Department Gazette Notification No. 44102-8, dated 12th December, 1984:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Kanhaiya Lal is justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. Both the parties appeared but subsequently the respondent absented and as such, *ex parte* proceedings order was passed against the respondent by me on 18th February, 1985.

3. Otherwise, the case of the workman is that he was employed with the respondent for the last 1½ years but the respondent choose to dispense with his employment on 6th September, 1984 in flagrant disregard of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

4. Subsequently the respondent also absented and as such, *ex parte* proceedings order was passed against the respondent on 18th February, 1985.

5. Today, the case was fixed for *ex parte* evidence of the workman, who is not present. His learned Authorised Representative Shri Man Singh stated that the workman is not forthcoming inspite of many reminders sent by him. So, it seems that the workman is not interested in prosecution of the reference. So, this reference is dismissed for non-prosecution and answered accordingly. There is no order as to cost.

B. P. JINDAL,

Dated the 18th March, 1985.

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court, Rohtak,
Camp Court, Bhiwani.

Endorsement No. 275/84/534, dated the 29th March, 1985.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B.P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court, Rohtak,
Camp Court, Bhiwani.